

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
June 28, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on June 28, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. Meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip chart notes taken during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – May 24, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the May 24, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #R20:** Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group review Interim Task Force document and provide comments including directions for Task Force to DWR by June 8.
- Status:** Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR reported that Michael Pierce was the only participant to provide comments. His written comments were the same as those given at the last Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. A discussion on Recreation and Socioeconomics Interim Projects Task Force guidance is included on tonight's agenda.
- Action Item #R21:** Feather River Recreation and Parks District, the JPA's contractor, DWR and consultants will prepare presentation package of Riverbend Park for preview at June Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.
- Status:** A Riverbend Park presentation is included on tonight's agenda.
- Action Item #R22:** Review the revised Issue Sheets and provide comments to the consultants.
- Status:** Steve Nachtman of the consulting team reported that no comments had been received from Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group participants. A discussion of the draft Preliminary Issues Sheets is included on tonight's agenda.
- Action Item #R23:** Discuss proposed Issue Statement S3.
- Status:** The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed that a new issue statement at this time should be submitted to the Plenary Group as a comment to the Scoping Document with the understanding that new issue statements have not been discussed in the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. Steve Nachtman pointed out that there are several members of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that also attend the Plenary Group meetings and could include a new issue statement with their submitted comments.

Facilities Tour

Dale Hoffman-Floerke asked Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group participants if they would be interested in a facilities tour similar to the scheduled July 17 Plenary Group tour but with

an emphasis on recreation facilities. Participants responded favorably and offered the following potential stops of interests: the new campground at Lime Saddle, Nelson Bar car top boat launch, Riverbend Park site, Lakeland Blvd, Thermalito Forebay and Afterbay, and selected parts of the Wildlife Area.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to schedule the facilities tour on July 26, from 10 am to 3 pm. Participants requested DWR staff develop an itinerary for the tour and include as many of the suggested stops as possible. The participants were encouraged to sign up for the tour before the end of the meeting and advised that they could choose to go on the July 17 Plenary Group Tour if they could not attend the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group tour on July 26.

Meeting Calendar

The Facilitator provided the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group with a calendar containing the dates and times of all Work Group and Plenary Group meetings set through February 2002. The calendar is appended to this summary as Attachment 4. She added that the Engineering and Operations Work Group had already made some proposed changes to their meeting schedule not reflected on the calendar but that these changes would be posted on the relicensing web site once confirmed.

Riverbend Park Interim Project Presentation

Scott Lawrence of the Feather River Recreation and Parks District introduced a presentation regarding Riverbend Park, including key individuals who had helped in the development of the proposal. Pete Dangermond and Helen Selph of the Dangermond Group made the formal overhead presentation of Riverbend Park to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. The presentation is appended to this summary as Attachment 5.

Pete described the location and history of the Riverbend Park site, how the park would fill special community needs, enjoys significant community and agency support, and takes advantage of special recreational opportunities on the river. He outlined the broad objectives the Riverbend Park development would satisfy and how it conforms to a variety of local and regional planning documents.

Pete outlined the nine portions of the project that in aggregate make up the interim Riverbend Park Project proposal, described a general strategy for environmental compliance, and explained how the project would be phased for more efficient development. The presentation also included estimated project costs and revenue sources.

- Harry Williamson of the National Park Service asked who would be responsible for managing the facilities and where the funding for operations and maintenance would come from. He also questioned whether the level of O & M funding shown in the presentation was adequate. Dangermond responded that the Feather River Recreation and Parks District would be responsible for managing the facilities. He added that the project proposal is predicated on the State providing O & M funding on an on-going basis and explained that the level of O & M described in the proposal is consistent with values based on data from other projects (approximately \$4,000 per acre of developed parkland).
- Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors was concerned that the project as described no longer seemed to fit the definition of interim projects as previously agreed to by the Recreation and Socioeconomic Interim Projects Task Force. He recalled that an interim project was described by the Task Force as within the scope of the existing license, requiring no environmental analysis, and could be accomplished quickly. Craig continued that while the Riverbend Project would clearly be beneficial to the community, it did not seem to meet any of

those criteria. He asked how many of the nine elements described in the proposal presentation were in the original master plan for the park. Pete responded that the nine elements represented nearly full build-out for the park. Other participants agreed that there were differing views of what an interim project could be. One participant suggested that since DWR has not provided a monetary limit for interim project funding, any project regardless of cost could be considered. Michael Pierce suggested that given the support the project has and the need for DWR to project a positive image during the relicensing effort, Riverbend Park should be pursued even if it does not strictly fall under the guidelines of an interim project.

- Craig Jones asked if Riverbend Park would be included as part of a settlement agreement in the new license application. He also wanted to know if agreeing to build Riverbend Park jeopardized the other interim projects still under consideration. The Facilitator reminded the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that DWR has always made clear that any interim project would need to be part of a settlement agreement. Ward Tabor of DWR added that since the proposed project was not within the FERC boundary, FERC would not be included in any decision to develop the project, however DWR was pursuing an agreement that would allow them to include Riverbend Park in a settlement agreement for the new license and build the project now.
- One participant suggested that the interim project funding be limited to the project infrastructure components as had been originally requested.
- One participant asked if there would be a use fee associated with the facilities. Pete responded that major components of the park would be cost free to users but that some features, such as the boat ramp and group picnic areas, may have a use fee. He added that concessions located at the park could generate revenue as well.
- Craig Jones asked what would happen if the Department of Boating and Waterways grant for the new boat launching facility is not approved. Pete responded that people were already using the location as a boat launch and it is likely that level of use would continue. However, if the DBW grant were not approved, the major improvements to that feature would be deferred. Another participant added that the Feather River Parks District has hired a grant writer in an effort to secure additional funds for the project.

The Facilitator reminded participants that the presenters had been tasked to develop a package regarding Riverbend Park to ultimately present to the Plenary Group and that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to critique the presentation. She asked if any participants had comments or revisions they would like to see.

- Patricia Watters from the Metropolitan Water District suggested that a slide be added near the end of the presentation showing the nexus between Riverbend Park and the Oroville Facilities operation.
- Craig Jones suggested the following: provide more detailed cost figures and substitute funding sources, provide more detail on the O & M figures and elaborate on the settlement agreement concept outlined by Ward Tabor.
- The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to approve the presentation with revisions as suggested, for presentation to the Plenary Group for their consideration.

Task Force Guidance

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group discussed disposition of the remaining interim projects, the potential impact approving Riverbend Park might have on them, and what guidance the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group might provide to the Interim Projects Task Force regarding the review and preparation of the remaining interim projects for consideration by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. Participants agreed that concerns raised at their previous meeting regarding the prioritization of the remaining interim projects warranted a discussion at the Task Force level and potentially a re-assessment. The Facilitator pointed out to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that the Interim Projects Task Force had not

been asked to prioritize the projects and this activity could occur on the Work Group level if desired. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group decided that the Interim Projects Task Force should develop additional criteria that would help them prioritize the remaining projects in a more scientific or quantifiable manner.

Kate Foley of the Department of Parks and Recreation mentioned that some of DPR submitted interim projects were not among those considered by the Task Force and her hope was that they would be evaluated at this time. Steve Nachtman suggested that the Task Force reconvene to discuss issues raised by Interim Projects Task Force and Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group participants. This may include development of more detailed criteria for prioritizing the remaining projects, evaluation of some projects inadvertently dropped prior to the initial screening, and gathering additional information for projects. Dale Hoffman-Floerke added that any projects not developed as part of the interim process, would be considered in the long-term recreation plan developed during the relicensing effort. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to allow the Interim Projects Task Force to continue its work as outlined above. The Interim Projects Task Force agreed to meet on July 10 at 9:30 am at the Oroville Field Division.

- One participant asked if DWR had developed a budget for developing the projects that make it through the Interim Project process. Dale Hoffman-Floerke responded that DWR was not planning to develop a budget for the interim projects, choosing instead to consider each on individual merits. Dave Ferguson of DWR added that this is consistent with DWR policy regarding annual budgets for recreation-oriented capital improvements. He stated that DWR does not budget money for projects annually, instead funding projects as they are proposed.

Issue Sheet Development – Resource Goals and Geographic Scope

At their previous meeting the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group directed the consultants to revise the resource goals and geographic scope for each Issue Sheet for review at this meeting. The consultants asked participants to provide comments to them in writing prior to this meeting for inclusion in that review process. Suggested revisions received from Butte County and the Plumas National Forest (distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at their May meeting), were reviewed by the consultants and incorporated into the revised document distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at this meeting. The Draft Preliminary Issue Sheets with revised Geographic Scope and Resource Goals, including comments from this meeting are appended to this summary as Attachment 6.

The Facilitator shared a draft graphic to remind the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group where we are in the process. The graphic indicated how the development of Issue Statements and Issue Sheets fits into the process of study plan development. The Facilitator provided a brief overview of how Issue Sheet development fits with other Work Group activities such as scoping document preparation and study plan development. She added that the Administrative Draft Scoping Document 1 had been distributed to the Plenary Group for review and revision at their July 17 meeting. She reminded participants that the Issue Sheets are working documents for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group to use while crafting study plans. Steve Nachtman added that it was the goal of DWR to have the Study Plans finished by February 2002 with draft Study Plans prepared by late 2001.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group reviewed Preliminary Issue Sheets R1, R2 and R3 during this meeting; participants directed the consulting team to revise the remaining Issue Sheets, based on the comments and recommendations from this meeting and distribute the revised Preliminary Issue Sheets to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group prior to their July meeting. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review the revised Preliminary Issue Sheets at their next meeting.

- Harry Williamson asked when the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group would begin to determine nexus to the project when discussing resource goals and issues. He is concerned that some issues do not appear to have a connection to project operation and, if left untested could be legitimized in a study plan. John Ruben of Santa Clara County Water District agreed and added that he voiced a similar concern at the recent Environmental Task Force meeting. Both suggested that issues need to be filtered to include only those that have a reasonable nexus to the project. The Facilitator responded that the Plenary Group is in the process of reviewing the Administrative Draft Scoping Document 1 and may take up this issue at their next meeting. Additionally, Ruben reported that the Environmental Task Force removed an Issue Statement when they determined that it was an approach and not a study. Steve Nachtman added that filtering issues does not occur at a distinct moment in time but rather throughout the process as draft Scoping Document 1 is reviewed and the Study Plans are developed. John Ruben replied that as long as issues remain in the Issue Sheets some participants would have the expectation that they will be studied. He added that it would be better to have the discussion now rather than disappointing people down the line. Craig Jones added that an issue that does not have nexus to the project could be considered part of a settlement agreement but not be studied. Many of the proposed interim projects are examples of this.

Next Meeting

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group will meet again on:
Thursday, July 26, 2001
6 pm to 10 pm
Oro Health Club

Agreements Made

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to forward the Riverbend Park presentation with suggested revisions to the Plenary Group for consideration at their next meeting.
2. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to reconvene the Recreation and Socioeconomics Interim Projects Task Force to consider issues related to the remaining interim projects. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Interim Projects Task Force agreed to meet on July 10, at 9:30 am, at the Oroville Field Division.
3. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet on July 26, at 10 am, for a tour of recreation-oriented sites associated with the Oroville Facilities.
4. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review revised Issue Sheets prepared by the consultants and provide review and comment at their next meeting.
5. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet again on July 26, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM at the Oro Health Club.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, participant(s) responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #R24: Present revised Riverbend Park presentation to the Plenary Group for their consideration.

Responsible: Riverbend Park sub group

Due Date: July 17, 2001

Action Item #R25: Reconvene Recreation and Socioeconomics Interim Projects Task Force to develop and execute a strategy for addressing the remaining interim projects. Report back to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at July 26 meeting.

Responsible: Task Force
Due Date: July 10, 2001

Action Item #R26: Review revised Issue Sheets and provide comments to the consultants.
Responsible: Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group
Due Date: July 26, 2001